

## **REMARKS**

In the Official Action mailed on **29 June 2005**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-21, 23, and 24. Claims 1-5, 7, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants admitted prior art, (USPub 2003/0056197, hereinafter “AAPA”) in view of Parlante (*Linked List Basics*, Stanford CS Education Library, hereinafter “Parlante”). Claims 9-13, 15-21, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Parlante, further in view of Vazquez et al (USPN 6,763,515, hereinafter “Vazquez”).

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Independent claims 1 and 17 were rejected as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Parlante. Independent claim 9 was rejected as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Parlante, further in view of Vazquez. Applicant respectfully points out that AAPA teaches examining the source code to **determine the data structures** within the kernel (see AAPA, paragraph [0007]).

In contrast, the present invention **cross-references the data structure definitions** (see paragraphs [0045]-[0046] of the instant application). This is beneficial because it provides the linkages among the data structure definitions to the user so that the user can better understand how the data structures relate to each other. There is nothing within AAPA, Parlante, or Vazquez, either explicit or implicit, which suggests cross-referencing the data structure definitions.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 to include the limitations of dependent claims 5, 13, and 21, respectively, to clarify that the present invention cross-references the data structure definitions. These amendments find support in paragraphs [0045]-[0046] of the instant application. Dependent claims 3, 5, 11, 13, 19, and 21 have been canceled without prejudice. Dependent claims 4, 12, and 20 have been amended to correct antecedent basis.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 9, and 17 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2, 4, and 7-8, which depend upon claim 1, claims 10, 12, and 15-16, which depend upon claim 9, and claims 18, 20, and 23-24, which depend upon claim 17, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

## CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
Edward J. Grundler  
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 11 August 2005

Edward J. Grundler  
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
2820 Fifth Street  
Davis, CA 95616-7759  
Tel: (530) 759-1663  
FAX: (530) 759-1665